



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/672,656

09/26/2003

Lawrence Allen Rigge

7

8206

47386 7590 08/11/2008

RYAN, MASON & LEWIS, LLP

1300 POST ROAD

SUITE 205

FAIRFIELD, CT 06824

EXAMINER

DOAN, KIET M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/11/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/672,656	Applicant(s) RIGGE, LAWRENCE ALLEN	
	Examiner KIET DOAN	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 May 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-7,11-14,16-19 and 23-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-7,11-14,16-19 and 23-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 9/26/03 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 05/30/2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 13 and 25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 2, 4, 12, 13, 16 and 24-25 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nozawa et al. (US 6,942,157 B2) in view of Cheung et al. (US 6,577,157 B1) and further view of Tamagno et al. (US 2004/0215471 A1).

Consider **claims 1, 13 and 25**. Nozawa teaches a method for wireless communication between an integrated circuit device and a monitoring station, said method comprising the steps of:

transmitting a wireless signal from said integrated circuit device to said monitoring station using an antenna associated with said integrated circuit device (Col.1, lines 65-67, Col. 2, lines 7-15, Col. 3, lines 55-67 teach IC communicate with another in wireless manner). **Nozawa fails to explicitly teach**

wherein said antenna is a pin on said integrated circuit device, and monitoring station perform one or more of testing debugging and evaluating said integrated circuit.

In an analogous art, **Cheung teaches** wherein said antenna is a pin on said integrated circuit device (Col. 3, lines 60-67, Col. 5, lines 44-49 teaches pin as antenna).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nozawa with Cheung's system such that the integrated circuit device have a pin antenna that wirelessly communicated with monitor device in order to operating the communication in a reducing size of an compact area.

However, **Nozawa and Cheung fail to explicitly teach** monitoring station perform one or more of testing, debugging and evaluating said integrated circuit.

In an analogous art, **Tamagno teaches** monitoring station perform one or more of testing debugging and evaluating said integrated circuit (Abstract, paragraphs [0007], [0020], Fig.1, shows the Host 12 as reading on monitor device that perform debugging for smart card device wherein the integrated circuit is used in a smart card).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nozawa and Cheung with Tamagno's system such that

an integrated circuit device have a pin antenna that wirelessly communicated with monitor device and monitoring station perform one or more of testing debugging and evaluating said integrated circuit in order to enable the communication in a reducing size of an compact area

Consider **claims 2 and 14**. The combination of Nozawa and Cheung and Tamagno teach the method of claim 1. Further, Nozawa teaches wherein said antenna is incorporated in said integrated circuit device (Col. 3, lines 55-59).

Consider **claims 4 and 16**. The combination of Nozawa and Cheung and Tamagno teach the method of claim 2. Further, Cheung teaches wherein at antenna is printed on said integrated circuit device (Col.1, lines 46-51).

Consider **claims 12 and 24**. The combination of Nozawa and Cheung and Tamagno teach the method of claim 1. Further, Cheung teaches wherein said signal is a memory pattern to be applied to a memory area on said integrated circuit device (Col.2, lines 57-62, Col.3, lines 14-17).

5. Claims 5-7 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nozawa et al. (US 6,942,157 B2) in view of Cheung et al. (US 6,577,157 B1) in view of Tamagno et al. (US 2004/0215471 A1) and further view of Welch (US 2004/0097246 A1).

Consider **claims 5-7, 17-19**. The combination of Nozawa and Cheung and Tamagno teach the method of claim 1 **but is silent on** wherein said signal is transmitted in accordance with an 802.11 wireless standard.

In an analogous art, **Welch teaches** wherein said signal is transmitted in accordance with an 802.11/ultra wide band/Bluetooth wireless standard (Paragraph [0017]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nozawa and Cheung and Tamagno with Welch 's system such that signal transmitted in 802.11/ultra wide band/Bluetooth wireless standard in order to users operated communication in short range.

6. Claims 11 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nozawa et al. (US 6,942,157 B2) in view of Cheung et al. (US 6,577,157 B1) in view of Tamagno et al. (US 2004/0215471 A1) and further view of Schmidt (US 2002/0196029 A1).

Consider **claims 11 and 23**. The combination of Nozawa and Cheung and Tamagno teach the method of claim 1 **but is silent on** wherein said signal is a test command.

In an analogous art, **Schmidt teaches** wherein said signal is a test command (paragraph [0009]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nozawa and Cheung and Tamagno with Schmidt's

system such that signal is a test command in order to enable communication on the mobile device.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KIET DOAN whose telephone number is (571)272-7863. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Appiah N. Charles can be reached on 571-272-7904. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Charles N. Appiah/

Art Unit: 2617

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617 If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kiet Doan/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Charles N. Appiah/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617